

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/773,007	02/06/2004	Scott S. Isola	M24-108	5360	
7	590 06/26/2006		EXAM	INER	
R. Neil Sudol 714 Colorado Avenue			PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F		
Bridgeport, C7			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			3739		
			DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			0			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/773,007	ISOLA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>			
	Michael Peffley	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss -			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·			
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 F	ebruary 2004					
	s action is non-final.					
· <u> </u>	<del>, _</del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application	1					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>34-37</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,12-16 and 31</u> is/are rejected.	<u> </u>					
7) Claim(s) <u>2-11,17-30,32 and 33</u> is/are objected	to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 February 2004</u> is/ar		ed to by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		1.121(d).			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-	152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	ts have been received.  ts have been received in Applicat  rity documents have been receiv  u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/17/04; 10/24/05.	4)  Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal I 6)  Other:		52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/773,007 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

## **Drawings**

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the originally filed drawings are deemed to be informal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al (6,056,735) in view of the teaching of Wilk et al (5,383,883).

Okada et al disclose a surgical device comprising a forceps member having at least one prong (1) and a mechanical connector (i.e. proximal handle) for removably fastening the forceps member to a housing (4) of an ultrasonic probe (7). Okada et al fail to teach providing an electrode and electrical connection means connected to the forceps prong.

Wilk et al teach that it is generally known to provide an ultrasonic forceps device with an electrical connection to the jaw assembly to allow for the treatment of tissue with both RF and ultrasonic energy.

To have provided the Okada et al device with an RF electrode on the forceps prong to allow for the treatment of tissue with both RF and ultrasonic energy would have been an obvious modification for one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the teaching of Wilk et al.

Claims 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al ('735) and Wilk et al ('883) as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Williamson et al (6,024,741).

Neither Okada et al nor Wilk et al expressly teach that the prong member(s) is made from an insulative material with an electrode thereon. The examiner maintains that it is generally well known to make RF forceps devices with insulative jaw members having electrodes located thereon. Williamson et al is one such teaching of a forceps-type device that has jaws made from an insulative substrate with the electrodes provided at selected areas on the jaw member to provide a desired treatment pattern to tissue.

To have provided the Okada et al device, as modified by the teaching of Wilk et al, with an insulative jaw member having the electrode mounted on the insulative substrate would have been an obvious design consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly in view of the Williamson et al teaching.

Art Unit: 3739

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-11, 17-30, 32 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art fails to disclose the particular connection arrangement between the forceps device and the ultrasonic probe as set forth in these claims.

Claims 34-37 are allowed. The prior art fails to disclose the particular method steps of attaching a forceps device to an ultrasonic probe casing and, in particular, detaching the forceps member from the casing after treating tissue. It is noted that prior art references such as Okada et al ('735) disclose a forceps device attached to an ultrasonic probe casing as asserted in the rejection. However, there is no suggestion of detaching the forceps device after tissue treatment as set forth in method claim 34.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Miyawaki et al (6,193,709) disclose another ultrasonic grasping device analogous to the Okada et al device. Mollenauer (2004/0064151) and Truckai et al (6,773,409) disclose forceps device that use ultrasonic energy to treat tissue. Brown et al (6,723,092) and Treat et al (6,860,880) disclose RF forceps devices and disclose that ultrasonic vibration may also be used to treat tissue. Manna et al (6,736,814) disclose an ultrasonic probe that is fitted with RF electrodes to treat tissue. There is no disclosure of a forceps device in the Manna et al device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 6am-3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Peffled Primary Examiner Art Unit 3739

mp June 19, 2006